

this title under the headings "DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION" and "INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS" shall be available to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out the study required by subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 2783, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To make available from Medical Services, \$1,000,000 for education debt reduction for mental health care professionals who agree to employment at the Department of Veterans Affairs)

On page 52, after line 21, add the following: SEC. 229. Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this title under the headings "VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION" and "MEDICAL SERVICES", \$1,000,000 may be available for education debt reduction under subchapter VII of chapter 76 of title 38, United States Code, for mental health care professionals who agree to employment at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:34 p.m., recessed and reassembled at 2:15 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2774

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 5 minutes of debate, equally divided, on amendment No. 2774, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE.

Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The Inhofe amendment would actually make us less secure by restricting our ability to improve security at facilities that house detainees who have been transferred from Guantanamo to the United States for their trials. Our communities will be less safe because money cannot be spent to make more secure the places where these detainees are being kept. It seems to me this is kind of a "cutting off your nose to spite your face" approach. Regardless of how people voted on whether we should have trials in the United States, the decision has been made that there are going to be trials in the United States. There already have been trials in the United States. There are detainees who are awaiting trial in the United States. It would seem to me it is in everybody's interest that the places where these detainees are being kept should be as secure as possible. It makes no sense, regardless of what one's position is on the question of where the trial should be held, not to have them kept in the most secure possible facilities.

I hope the Inhofe amendment is defeated. It is counterproductive, no matter what position one takes on the location of trials.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the amendment sponsored by Senator INHOFE is one of a series of amendments that have recently been offered in the Senate that would put political interests ahead of our national interests. This amendment would prohibit any funds from being used to construct or modify any facility in the United States to hold any individual who is currently being held at the Guantanamo Bay detention facility.

This goal of this amendment is to ensure that the detainees being held at Guantanamo Bay, some for years without charge, cannot be tried in our Federal courts and that the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay cannot close. This is harmful to our national security and devastating to our reputation throughout the world. As a former prosecutor, I find it deeply troubling that the Senate would be asked to prohibit the administration from trying even dangerous terrorists in our Federal courts. As a Senator, I find it shameful that Congress is being asked to help keep open a facility that has been a stain on our reputation throughout the world and has given ammunition to our enemies. GEN Colin Powell was correct when he said, "Guantanamo has become a major problem for America's perception as it's seen; the way the world perceives America."

President Obama addressed that problem in the first days of his Presidency by announcing that he would close Guantanamo Bay, and he has affirmed that commitment by announcing that the administration will have a preference for trying detainees in our proven Federal courts. Just last week, the Attorney General announced that, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Government will begin to move toward federal criminal trials against five of these detainees, including Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. I have supported President Obama and the Attorney General in these steps, and I will continue to do so. That is why I have voted against amendments that would withhold funding to close the Guantanamo detention facility and prohibit any Guantanamo detainees from being brought to the United States. These amendments undermine the good work the President is doing, and they make us less safe, not safer.

Two weeks ago, the Senate defeated another amendment that would have restricted the authority and the options of our military and law enforcement. Secretary Gates and Attorney General Holder sent us a joint letter opposing that amendment. They reminded us that we should not prohibit the Government from being able to "use every lawful instrument of national power . . . to ensure that terrorists are brought to justice and can no longer threaten American lives." That is exactly what this amendment would do by tying the administration's hands in the event that they need to upgrade

any facility in order to securely house these detainees. I will ask that a copy of the administration's letter be printed in the RECORD.

Again, this week, joined by Secretary Napolitano, Attorney General Holder and Secretary Gates wrote to the Senate in opposition, this time to the Inhofe amendment we consider today. I will ask that the administration's letter be printed in the RECORD.

Instead of closing Guantanamo and moving toward a lawful and effective national security policy, this amendment would say to the world that we refuse to face what we did at Guantanamo and instead would continue the legacy of a place that was created in an effort to lock people up for years without charge and not face the consequences. This amendment would say to the world that we are not strong enough, that our over 200-year-old superior legal tradition is not flexible enough, to allow us to deal with those who attack us. Refusing to close Guantanamo also means we lose our ability to respond with moral authority if other countries should mistreat American soldiers or civilians.

Much debate has focused on keeping Guantanamo detainees out of the United States. In this debate, political rhetoric has entirely drowned out reason and reality. Our criminal justice system handles extremely dangerous criminals, and more than a few terrorists, and it does so safely and effectively. We try very dangerous people in our courts and hold very dangerous people in our jails throughout the country. I know; I put some of them there. We do it every day in ways that keep the American people safe and secure, and I have absolute confidence that we can do it for even the most dangerous terrorism suspects.

The facts speak for themselves. The Judiciary Committee has held several hearings on the issue of how to best handle detainees, and experts and judges from across the political spectrum have agreed that our courts and our criminal justice system can handle this challenge and indeed has handled it many times already. Since January of this year alone over 30 terrorism cases have been either successfully tried or sentenced using our Federal courts. No one has ever escaped from a Supermax facility. In fact terrorists are routinely and securely held at our prisons, including Zacharias Moussaoui, one of the plotters behind the September 11 attacks and Ramzi Yousef, the World Trade Center bomber.

Why would the Senate pass an amendment that suggests that our country and the brave men and women who staff these prisons cannot handle these prisoners, or that they are not up to the task? And why would we pass an amendment that simultaneously makes it harder for the government to securely detain terrorism suspects in our prisons by making any necessary adjustments to hold them? This amendment would ironically